Michael E. Langton, Esq. 801 Riverside Drive Reno, Nevada 89503 Voice: (775) 329-7557 Fax (775) 329-7447 MICHAEL E. LANGTON, Esq. Nevada Bar No.: 290 801 Riverside Drive Reno, NV 89503 (775) 329-7557

Attorney for Defendant

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CASE NO.: 3:18-cv-00539

LRH-WGC

Plaintiff,

vs.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, LOCAL UNION 533

Defendant.

<u>ANSWER</u>

COMES NOW Defendant International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local Union 533, by and through its undersigned attorney, and hereby files its Answer to the Complaint filed November 9, 2018.

INTRODUCTION

1. In response to paragraph 1 of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations set forth therein with the exception that the collective bargaining agreement referred to therein speaks for itself.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. In response to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Complaint, Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- 3. In response to paragraph 4 of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 4. In response to paragraph 5 of the Complaint, Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- 5. In response to paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Complaint, Defendant submits the document speaks for itself. As to any interpretation of said document stated within said paragraphs Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

 Waste Management Memorializes Its Meal and Break Guideline
- 6. In response to paragraph 10 of the Complaint, Defendant asserts the document speaks for itself.
- 7. In response to paragraph 11 of the Complaint, based upon information and belief Defendant admits that on July 20, 2018, Plaintiff unilaterally issued "Meal and Break Guidelines for NCN Collection Truck Drivers."
- 8. In response to paragraph 12 of the Complaint, Defendant denies that the "Meal and Break Guidelines" are requirements that the truck drivers must follow when taking lunch breaks. As to the remaining allegations of said paragraph, Defendant admits the allegations related to the OBU device.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

response to paragraph 13 of the Complaint, 9. In Defendant admits that during a meeting on August 20, 2018, between representatives of Plaintiff and Defendant a discussion was held concerning unpaid lunch breaks for Collection Truck Drivers and that representatives of Plaintiff Waste Management were not willing to modify the existing collective bargaining agreement. Except as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the allegations contained within paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

- In response to paragraph 14 and 15 of the Complaint, 10. Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- In response to paragraph 16 of the Complaint, 11. Defendant submits the document speaks for itself. necessary, Defendant denies any interpretative extend statements contained therein concerning Article 18, Section 5, of the collective bargaining agreement.
- 12. In response to paragraph 17 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that Plaintiff notified some employees and the Union that "failure to comply with the [new] Meal and Break Guidelines would result in discipline, to and including discharge." Expect as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
- In response to paragraphs 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 of 13. the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

14. In response to paragraphs 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

- 15. In response to paragraph 28 of the Complaint, based upon information and belief Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- 16. In response to paragraph 29 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that Mr. Watson sent an e-mail to the Reno Mayor and City Council members on or about October 31, 2018. As to the remaining allegations, Defendant submits the document speaks for itself.
- 17. In response to paragraph 30 of the Complaint, Defendant admits Mr. Watson sent an e-mail on October 31, 2018, to the Reno Mayor and City Council members. Except as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 18. In response to paragraphs 31, 32, and 33, of the Complaint, Defendant submits the document speaks for itself. Except as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 19. In response to paragraph 34 of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations set forth therein.
- 20. In response to paragraphs 35 and 36 of the Complaint, Defendant is without information sufficient to form an opinion as to the truth of the matters asserted therein and, on that basis, denies the allegations contained therein.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

response to paragraph 37 of the Complaint, 21. In Defendant admits that Mr. Keast sent a letter on or about Watson. Except as specifically November 2, 2018, to Mr. admitted herein, Defendant submits the documents speak for itself and denies any interpretative statements concerning said document.

- In response to paragraphs 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 of 22. the Complaint, Defendant submits the documents referenced therein speak for themselves. Except as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.
- In response to paragraphs 43 and 44 of the Complaint, 23. Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- In response to paragraphs 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49 of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.
- In response to paragraph 50 of the Complaint, 25. Defendant admits the allegations contained therein.
- 26. response to paragraph 51 of the Complaint, Defendant asserts that it is without information sufficient to form a truth of the matter asserted therein and, on that basis denies the allegations contained therein.
- In response to paragraphs 52, 53, 54, and 55 of the Complaint, Defendant asserts the documents referenced therein speak for themselves. Except as specifically admitted herein, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 29. In response to paragraphs 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62 of the Complaint, Defendant submits the documents speak for themselves. Except as admitted herein, Defendant denies any interpretative explanation by Plaintiff contained within said paragraphs and, accordingly, denies said allegations.
- 30. In response to paragraph 63 of the Complaint, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.
- 31. In response to paragraphs 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69, of the Complaint, Defendant is without information sufficient to form an opinion as to the belief of the matters asserted therein and, on that basis, denies the allegations contained therein.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief And Damages)

- 32. In response to paragraph 70 of the Complaint, Defendant reasserts its responses given to paragraphs 1 through 69 as if set forth herein in full.
- 33. In response to paragraphs 71 and 72 of the Complaint, Defendant admits the allegations contained there.
- 34. In response to paragraph 73 of the Complaint, Defendant submits the document speaks for itself.
- 35. In response to paragraph 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79, Defendant denies the allegations contained therein.

Michael E. Langton, Esq. 801 Riverside Drive Reno, Nevada 89503 Voice: (775) 329-7557 Fax (775) 329-7447

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

 Defendant has failed to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATION DEFENSE

2. The court lacks jurisdiction as the issue is properly in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. Plaintiff's Complaint is barred by the doctrine of clean hands.

WHEREFORE, Defendant Teamsters Local 533 prays for the
following relief:

- 1. That the Court dismiss the Complaint in its full with prejudice; and
- 2. An award for attorney's fees and costs incurred in defense of this action; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

DATED this / day of November, 2018.

Michael E. Langton, E Nevada Bar # 290

801 Riverside Drive

Reno, NV 89503 (775) 329-7557

Attorney for Defendant Teamsters Local 533

Michael E. Langton, Esq. 801 Riverside Drive Reno, Nevada 89503 Voice: (775) 329-7447

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of
Michael E. Langton, Esq., and that on the day of November,
2018, I served a true accurate copy of the foregoing ANSWER as
follows:
Deposited for mailing, first class postage prepaid;
Deposited for mailing, certified/registered;
Personal delivery to office;
Fax Sent Prior to Mailing;
Via E-mail
David B. Dornak, Esq. Mark J. Ricciardi, Esq. Fisher & Phillips LLP

300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 1500

Las Vegas NV 89101

MURRI KIRK Merri Kirk, Legal Assistant